

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
R. SCOTT WEIDE
WEIDE & MILLER, LTD.
330 SOUTH 3RD STREET
SUITE 1130
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year) **24 FEB 2003**

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

Applicant's or agent's file reference

IGTECH.0055P

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/US02/18875

12 June 2002 (12.06.2002)

15 June 2001 (15.06.2001)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): G06F 17/00 and US Cl.: 463/42

Applicant

IGT

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 15 October 2003 (15.10.2003).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231
Facsimile No. (703)305-3230

Authorized officer

Valencia Martin-Wallace

Telephone No. 703-306-5048

Sheila Vanev
Paralegal Specialist
Group 3700

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US02/18875

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 - pages 1-24, as originally filed
 - pages NONE, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 - pages 25-27, as originally filed
 - pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 - pages NONE, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 - pages 1-6, as originally filed
 - pages NONE, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 - pages NONE, as originally filed
 - pages NONE, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE
- ☒ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US02/18875

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>2, 3, 6, 9-18</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1, 4, 5, 7, 8</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-18</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-18</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Please See Continuation Sheet

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Franchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,770,533. Franchi discloses a casino operating system. Players can use a hand-held communication interface having a display for displaying game information (Fig. 17). The hand-held communication interface is capable of receiving and sending information (col. 15 lines 26-29). A game server generates game data, transmits game data to the hand-held communication interface and receives information from the communication interface. A payment transaction server validates payment and establishes entitlement of a player to play a game provided by the game server. The hand-held communication interface comprises a wireless communication interface (col. 15 lines 38-54, 66-67 & col. 16 lines 1-13). The hand-held communication interface includes a memory for storing game data from the game server for use in presenting a game and an interface for enabling transaction with the game server. The hand-held communication interface includes means for configuring information presented to a user based on a status of the user input thereto (col. 17 lines 59-67).

Claims 6, 15 and 18 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Franchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,770,533. Franchi discloses all of the limitations mentioned above. Franchi also discloses a transaction server for receiving a transaction service request from a slot machine communication interface (col. 8 lines 23-25 & Fig. 8). Moreover Franchi discloses a method of presenting a game to a user of a portable gaming interface associated with a gaming system including a game server and a payment transaction server. The system further comprises establishing communications between the portable gaming interface and the game and payment transaction servers via a wireless communications channel. Game data is obtained from the game server for presenting a game to a player (col. 15 lines 38-54, 66-67 & col. 16 lines 1-13 & Fig. 17). Franchi also discloses inputting data to a gaming interface, such as a slot machine for use by the payment transaction server in establishing entitlement of a player to obtain a service based on a provided value. For example in a slot machine players may place food service orders. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to allow for a transaction service request to be placed from a hand-held device. The transaction service request notifies the kitchen staff of a player's food order. It is obvious to include this option on the hand held device, to simplify a remote player's ability to order food.

Claims 2, 3, 9-14, 16 and 17 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Franchi in view of Burns, U.S. Patent No. 6,048,269. Franchi discloses a transaction server for receiving a transaction service request from a slot machine communication interface (col. 8 lines 23-25 & Fig. 8). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to allow for a transaction service request to be placed from a hand-held device. The transaction service request notifies the kitchen staff of a player's food order. It is obvious to include this option on the hand held device, to simplify a remote player's ability to order food. Franchi further discloses a card reader associated with the portable game interface (col. 18 lines 4-20). Franchi also discloses that his slot machines interfaces are adapted to display a plurality of interfaces for initiating transaction service requests (Fig. 8).

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Consequently, it is obvious to implement these interfaces on the portable game device so that they are also available to a remote player. Remote players wish to have every advantage as the player who will play at the regular machines. Franchi discloses all of the limitations mentioned above but lacks in disclosing a ticket reader. Burns et al. teaches of a coinless slot machine system and method. The slot machines include a ticket reader comprising a bar-code reader for reading a ticket having information used by said payment transaction server in validating payment. Moreover the payment transaction server verifies a value associated with an issued ticket (See Burns et al. col. 5 lines 66-67; col. 6 lines 1-5). Burns et al. also teaches of a gaming machine in communication with the payment transaction server in which at least one gaming machine is capable of issuing a ticket having a value associated therewith verifiable by the payment transaction server (See Burns et al. col. 6 lines 8-11). The ticket can also be printed by another gaming device such as a change machine (See Burns et al. col. 7 lines 5-8). It would have been obvious to implement a ticket reader and printer into the hand-held device of Franchi so that cashless gaming could occur. Moreover, players would not have to be bothered by carrying around large amounts of cash since they could just have the information stored on a ticket. Burns et al. also teaches of a login interface and access to the transaction server is dependent on a login status provided through the interface (See Burns et al. col. 7 lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to implement a login interface into the game of Franchi in order to provide added security, thereby not allowing people with unauthorized access to use the machines.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----